

REMARKS

Status Summary

Claims 1-48 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 16, 31 and 46-48 are presented in independent form. Claims 1-48 stand rejected. Claims 1, 16, 31 and 46-48 are amended herein.

Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application as originally filed. Specifically, the application as originally filed discusses image resources, movie resources, and other forms of media resources. Applicant submits that support for these amendments can be found at least at, for example, paragraph [0021] of the application as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been added.

Further, support for the recitation "presenting a visual representation of the media resource and a selectable visual representation of the relation for accessing a link included in the relation set" can also be found throughout the application as originally filed. Applicant submits that support for these amendments can be found at least at, for example, Figure 9 of the application as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been added.

Interview

Applicant expresses his gratitude to the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's undersigned representative during the telephone interview conducted on December 5, 2007. Potential amendments to the independent claims were discussed during the interview. The claims have been amended in the instant case in the manner kindly suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejection(s) - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-48 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,484,162 to Edlund, et al. (hereinafter "Edlund").

The Office Action includes a section rejecting claims 1-48 as being anticipated by Edlund. The Action, however, does not include any rationale for the 102 rejection. In fact, in another section, the Action states:

However, Edlund does not explicitly teach that the resource is a distinct, categorizable object associated with a resource type and stored in a data store. In Edlund, search queries are associated with objects on the network and stored for later retrieval and use to generate new, related search queries for like objects on the network.

Accordingly, since Edlund admittedly fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention for at least the above reasons, claims 1-48 are not anticipated by Edlund. Furthermore, rejected claims 1-48 are novel and inventive for at least the same reasons.

Claim Rejection(s) - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-48 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,162 to Edlund, et al. (hereinafter "Edlund"), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0131992 to Goldstein, et al. (hereinafter "Goldstein").

The combination of Edlund and Goldstein fails to disclose or suggest each and every recitation included in the amended claims for a variety of reasons. First, both Edlund and Goldstein fail to disclose or suggest a computer-implemented method, a computer readable medium, or a system for providing links to one or more resources related to a specified resource, wherein the resource is a media resource that is a distinct, categorizable media object associated with a resource type and stored in a data store. Second, neither Edlund nor Goldstein disclose or suggest "presenting a visual representation of the media resource and a selectable visual representation of the relation for accessing a link included in the relation set" as recited in the independent claims.

As stated above, both Edlund and Goldstein fail to disclose or suggest a computer-implemented method, a computer readable medium, or a system for providing

links to one or more resources related to a specified resource, wherein the resource is a media resource that is a distinct, categorizable media object associated with a resource type and stored in a data store. In the Office Action, the Office admits that "Edlund does not explicitly teach that the resource is a distinct, categorizable object associated with a resource type and stored in a data store." Applicant agrees with this conclusion. Accordingly, Edlund need not be discussed with regard to the above referenced recitation.

The Office relies on Goldstein as teaching "a system and method for permitting a user to search for related content items like a selected content item wherein the content item, i.e. resource is a distinct, categorizable object associated with a resource type and stored in a data store (Goldstein, paragraphs 0015, 0091, and 0192)." The objects described in the cited sections of Goldstein and throughout Goldstein are web pages. The web pages of Goldstein are not media objects as disclosed and claimed in the instant application. A media object can include an audio object, a video object, an image object, or any combination thereof. The web pages disclosed in Goldstein, in contrast, are HTML documents that can contain content. While the content included in the webpage may include media content, the webpage itself is not a media object as recited in claims 1, 16, and 31.

There is a clear delineation between a webpage object that can contain media content and a media object as recited in the instant application. As such, the cited combination fails to disclose or suggest wherein the resource is a media resource that is a distinct, categorizable media object associated with a resource type and stored in a data store as recited in the claims. Accordingly, claims 1, 16, and 31 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, since the cited documents fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations for at least the above reasons, the obviousness rejections of claims 1, 16, and 31 should be withdrawn. Furthermore, rejected claims 2-15, 17-30, and 32-45 are novel and inventive for at least the same reasons.

Further, claims 46-48 contain recitations directed to "wherein the image resource is at least one of an image object and a photo album object." As the cited combination fails to disclose or suggest a media object, the combination naturally fails to disclose or suggest at least one of an image object and a photo album object. As stated above, the Office relies on the web pages disclosed in Goldstein as disclosing or suggesting this recitation. These web pages cannot be said to disclose or suggest "at least one of an image object and a photo album object" as recited in claims 46-48.

As discussed during the interview, none of the references cited by the office disclose or suggest an arrangement for image objects or photo album objects as recited in the instant claims. Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 46-48 are considered novel and inventive over the cited prior art. Accordingly, since the cited documents fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations for at least the above reasons, the obviousness rejections of claims 46-48 should be withdrawn.

Returning to claims 1, 16, and 31, as stated above, neither Edlund nor Goldstein disclose or suggest "presenting a visual representation of the media resource and a selectable visual representation of the relation for accessing a link included in the relation set" as recited in the independent claims. In the Office Action, the above referenced recitation, added by the present amendment, is not discussed. The Office does, however, cite Edlund, col. 7, line 25 - col. 8, line 16 as disclosing means for displaying the relation set to the user. The cited section includes the following sections, among others:

Upon browsing the displayed search results on the computer display, the user can review both the identified database documents and the similar search queries and can, if desired, repeat the search process. Alternatively, the user may view one or more identified documents from the database before deciding whether to repeat the search process. These options are represented by the FIG. 5 decision box numbered 514.

As noted above, a user communicates with the Query Interface and receives search results through a GUI program, preferably a browser application. FIG. 6 is a representation of the display 602 that is presented to a user at the user computer 202 (FIG. 2) when viewing a Query

Interface display window. FIG. 6 shows an example of a browser Search Results display window 604 with a user ID text box 606 that contains a user ID, a query text box 608 that contains a search query, a search label text box 610 that contains a search query label, and a search description text box 612 that contains a search query description....At the bottom of the display window 604 is a listing of the search results, showing the entries in order of confidence level ranking. Those skilled in the art will recognize that a confidence level ranking is assigned by a search engine to indicate the similarity of the listed document to the search query.

A vertical scrolling bar 638 on the right edge of the window 604 can be used to scroll up and down the search results information, to view the remaining search results documents 620 not readily visible in the window.

Other sections of Edlund teach the display of search results, both current and past search results, in various modes. Nowhere in Edlund is there any section that discloses or suggests the recitation "providing for presenting a visual representation of the media resource and a selectable visual representation of the relation for accessing a link included in the relation set." Irrespective of what is cited as the resource, there is simply no presenting of a visual representation of the resource in any presentation of search results as taught by Edlund. Further, there is no selectable visual representation of the relation. A search query is displayed in Edlund. However, even assuming that the search query is the relation, the search query is not selectable. As the search query display is not selectable, it clearly can not be selectable for accessing a link included in the relation set. Accordingly Edlund can not be said to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations for at least the above reasons.

Although the Office Action only discusses Edlund in regard to displaying the relation, Applicant will address Goldstein as well with regard to the recitation discussed above. Goldstein fails to cure the deficiencies of Edlund discussed above in failing to disclose or suggest the recitation "providing for presenting a visual representation of the media resource and a selectable visual representation of the relation for accessing a link included in the relation set." Goldstein is directed to:

A method, system and apparatus for selecting, displaying, managing, tracking and transferring access to content of Internet web pages and other sources along with custom text messages has programming permitting a user to create custom selections of selected image, animation, movie and text content items, and other types of content items from web pages or other sources from the same or different network sources containing multiple content items, along with user-supplied text messages, in an independent, resizable, rescalable browser window; permitting the user to transfer access to the custom selection of content items to a recipient; permitting the user or recipient to navigate quickly to a source of a content item in the custom selection; and permitting the user to define search keywords for performing searches related to content items in a custom selection; and other features. A method of tracking viewing and sharing activities of content items and custom selections of content items by users and recipients is also disclosed. See Abstract

Goldstein discloses selecting and modifying content from a webpage. Goldstein provides numerous figures illustrating such web pages. Specifically, modifications of content on web pages such as Newyorktimes.com, Yahoo.com, and Sugar3.com are illustrated in Goldstein.

Goldstein does not disclose or suggest either a visual representation of the media resource or a selectable visual representation of the relation for accessing a link included in the relation set much less both as recited by the claims. As in Edlund above, irrespective of what is cited as the resource, there is simply no presenting of a visual representation of the resource in any presentation of a web page as taught by Goldstein. Further, there is no selectable visual representation of the relation. Certain annotations and widgets are displayed in conjunction with the web pages in Goldstein. However, even assuming that one of the annotations and the widgets is the relation, neither of these is selectable. As the annotations and widgets are not selectable, they clearly can not be selectable for accessing a link included in the relation set. Accordingly Goldstein can not be said to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations for at least the above reasons.

Accordingly, since the cited documents fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations for at least the above reasons, the obviousness rejections of claims 1, 16,

and 31 should be withdrawn. Furthermore, rejected claims 2-15, 17-30, and 32-45 are considered novel and inventive for at least the same reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitation in claims 2, 17 and 32. Claim 2 includes a recitation, among others, directed to "allowing for creating the matching criteria utilizing the plurality of parameters, wherein the one or more related resources satisfy the matching criteria." Claim 17 is a computer readable medium containing program instructions implementing the method of claim 2, and claim 32 is directed to a system for executing the method of claim 2. The template includes parameters associated with the resource type that can be used to create the matching criteria of the relation.

As discussed in previous communications, nothing in Edlund describes how their arrangement creates the query. Rather, the user in Edlund configures the query without assistance from their system. Nonetheless, the Office contends that Edlund discloses these features at column 8, line 52 to column 9, line 65, and states that Edlund allows a user to "retrieve prior search queries that assist the user in retrieving resources the user wants returned." In addition, the Office asserts that Edlund teaches "a domain mapping table comprising a hash table that contains domain specific query command[s] to aid the user in configuring the relation to the resource type the user wants returned (see column 9, lines 16-34).

As discussed in previous communications, the cited portion of Edlund describes the Label Manager component that automatically generates a label and description for the query based on the query's words and phrases. In this section of Edlund, the user has already composed his query and submitted it to the database. Nothing in the cited portion teaches or suggests configuring a relation by "allowing for selecting a resource type to be returned," retrieving a "template corresponding to the resource type" that includes "a plurality of parameters," and creating the "matching criteria utilizing the plurality of parameters," as recited in claim 2. Also, Edlund's prior search queries are not "templates corresponding to a resource type" and do not comprise "a plurality of

parameters associated with the corresponding resource type" that are utilized "to create the matching criteria." Finally, the mapping table mentioned in Edlund is used by the Label Manager to generate the label and description for the query based on the query's words and phrases. In particular, the table is used to translate indexing keys specified for a particular query language to a more human-understandable descriptor that can be used as a query label and description pair. See, column 9, lines 16-34. Accordingly Edlund does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 2 for at least the reasons stated above.

Further, Goldstein, as above, fails to cure the deficiencies of Edlund in this regard as well. Paragraphs 0015, 0091, and 0192 are cited by the Office Action as disclosing the recitations of claims 2, 17, and 32. Applicant respectfully asserts that nothing in these cited paragraphs, nor anywhere else in Goldstein, discloses or suggests "allowing for creating the matching criteria utilizing the plurality of parameters, wherein the one or more related resources satisfy the matching criteria." Goldstein does not disclose or suggest templates at all, much less a "template corresponding to the resource type" that includes "a plurality of parameters." Accordingly, Goldstein cannot be said to disclose or suggest creating the "matching criteria utilizing the plurality of parameters," as recited in claim 2.

Accordingly, since the cited documents fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations for at least the above reasons, the obviousness rejections of claims 2, 17, and 32 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney at the below-listed number if, after reviewing the above Remarks, the Examiner

Application No. 10/788,613
Paper filed December 10, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed August 8, 2007

Attorney Docket No. I223/US
Page 22 of 22

believes outstanding matters remain that may be resolved without the issuance of a subsequent Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, associated with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-3512.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 10, 2007

Customer No: 49278
111 Corning Road; Ste. 220
Cary, North Carolina 27518
919 233 1942 x219 (voice)
919 233 9907 (fax)

/John A. Demos/

John A. Demos
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 52,809